

LEADERS, THROUGH THE JOURNAL, TALK OF THE LATE ELECTION'S LESSONS.

No Doubt in Kentucky, Declares Henry Watterson.

"Kentucky's voters elect to follow the Chicago platform, and to stand by Mr. Bryan of Nebraska."



"Partisans who doubt nothing until they stumble over something are already counting their chickens."

"There is nothing in sight to restrain the leaders of the dominant Democracy in Kentucky."

By Henry Watterson.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Nov. 7.—The smoke of battle having measurably cleared away, thoughtful people may survey the field with the hope of arriving at something like an intelligible opinion.

The great State of New York and the city of Greater New York have completely reversed the vote of a year ago, but the Democrats there eliminated from their plan of campaign all disturbing national issues, and, excepting as to the Henry George movement, which collapsed with the death of its leader, were united on their State and local tickets. In Maryland Senator Gorman goes down; and yet the closeness of the vote shows that, except for a partial agreement among the Democrats, the Republicans would have swept the State. They hold their own strongholds, like Massachusetts and Iowa, but get a blow which, recalling their tremendous majority of a year ago, looks like a knockout in Ohio.

No Doubt in Kentucky.

HERE IN KENTUCKY THE RETURNS LEFT NO ROOM FOR DOUBT. THE VOTERS WILL NOT HAVE REPUBLICANISM AT ANY PRICE. THEY WILL NOT HAVE FUSION AT ANY PRICE. THEY WILL NOT HAVE A THIRD PARTY, OR TAKE A MIDDLE COURSE AT ANY PRICE. THEY ELECT TO FOLLOW ALL THE EXCESSES OF THE CHICAGO PLATFORM AND TO STAND BY MR. BRYAN, OF NEBRASKA, AND A REPETITION IN 1900 OF THE ILL-STARRED CAMPAIGN OF 1896. HAVING BRUSHED ASIDE ALL OBSTRUCTIONS AND SIMPLIFIED THE SITUATION THEY RANGE THEMSELVES BY A GREAT MAJORITY UPON THE SIDE OF THE EXTREMES OF THE EXTREMISTS.

There is nothing upon the surface, or immediately in sight, to restrain the leaders of the dominant Democracy. They have the State in a sling and may do with it as they please. He who crosses their path or gets in their way will have his labor for his pains if he have not cause to rue his temerity. No prudent man is likely to attempt it. For the time being, at least conservatism, like Magnity, has gone to the bottom of the sea.

Ours is supposed to be, and in one sense at least it is, a government of the people, and as each nation is said to possess exactly the government it deserves, the people of the United States cannot complain if their being the freest in the world is at the same time the most prodigal and unequal. Its dominion is so vast, with interests so varied, that nothing short of a division of parties always, absolute and sometimes tyrannous, can reduce its political decisions, such as they are, to proportion and method.

There are two parties, one calling itself the Republican party, and the other calling itself the Democratic party. But the Democrat in Massachusetts and Maine, and the Democrat in California and Texas, the Republican in Rhode Island and Vermont, and the Republican in Oregon and Colorado, can reach but an approximate understanding, and must take many things on trust.

Those who have served upon platform committees in national conventions will recall that divergences invariably arose when questions of a geographical character or tendency put in an appearance. The virtue and intelligence which are supposed to be inherent to republican institutions and to embellish the popular character, have usually discovered an eye for the main chance; and General Hancock builded wiser than he knew when he described the tariff as "a local question." That the wisdom of many exceeds the wisdom of one, may still be accepted as a truism. But when we seek to ascertain, by a careful study of the election returns, just what the sum total of the aggregated wisdom actually is, and what it specifically wants, we are met by many contradictions.

There appears to have been "local issues" everywhere. Mr. Gorman was a "local issue" in Maryland. Mr. Hanna was a "local issue" in Ohio. Of course, "local issues" dwarfed all other issues in Greater New York.

THE FREE SILVER LEADERS AND ORGANS IN KENTUCKY NATURALLY INSIST THAT THE RESULT THIS YEAR IS A REVERSAL OF THE RESULT OF LAST YEAR, AND CLAIMED DEMOCRATIC MAJORITIES WHEREVER THEY APPEARED AS SURE EVIDENCE THAT FREE SILVER IS YET TO COME TO ITS OWN, IF THEY BE CORRECT IN THIS THE FUTURE WILL BE INDENTED EAST AND WEST FOR THEM. BUT IF THEY BE MISTAKEN, AND I THINK THEY ARE, THE REJOICING OF THE PRESENT WILL BE CHANGED TO MOURNING TWO YEARS HENCE IN THE STATE AND THREE YEARS HENCE IN THE NATION.

Capricious Popular Verdicts.

During the last twelve years the popular verdicts have certainly been most capricious. Cleveland in 1884 on a tariff straddle; Harrison in 1888 on straight protection and the McKinley bill; Cleveland again in 1892 on a radical "revenue only" platform; McKinley in 1896, the money issue absorbing all other issues, and now the Dingley bill, followed by a Democratic revival in 1897. Who shall predict with any assurance just what will happen in 1898 and 1900?

Intense and eager partisans who doubt nothing until they have stumbled over something are already counting their chickens out of this year's basket of eggs; but, taking their cue from the lessons of the twelve years intervening between 1885 and 1897, men less optimistic and confident will think twice before they venture upon any forecast to gamble on.

Meanwhile, certain principles, which stand back of party issues and give the breath of life to party leaders, remain upon the scene as actual and vital as they ever were—immortal, for truth can never die. And here are three simple propositions in which good government must enmesh itself, from which it must draw its sustenance. If we are to turn the corner of the new century a republic in both the substance and the spirit which were designed by these makers of the Constitution:

First, the Government has no right, either equitable or legal, to tax the people except to raise money for its own support; every dollar of taxation diverted from this purpose is robbery; and it is equally important that the money legally collected shall be honestly applied.

Second, the right of the people to local self-government is an inalienable right—to local options in the counties; to home rule in the cities; to all rights in the State not expressly delegated to the general government; and the preservation of this right of local self-government is essential to that just equilibrium between liberty and law which is the cornerstone of our system of federal and State institutions.

Money Must Be Good Money.

Third, the money of the country must be good money, circulating everywhere, unquestioned and unquestionable; recognised at once and taken at its full value; and that to attain this universal recognition and acceptance must consist of gold and silver and paper, the whole of interchangeable value, each convertible into the other on demand and freely circulating side by side. Treating of these three propositions, the Courier-Journal of to-morrow will say:

"These propositions are as true now as ever they were. In a general way they embrace the political issues of the day. If they be Democracy, then we are a Democrat. If they be not Democracy, then we are not a Democrat. In our judgment we cannot have enlightened conservative government until they are realized in all national and State legislation, and, as so realized, settled finally and for all time. We long ago called them to the masthead, and there they are in the full view of all men. We shall not trouble ourselves in future whether their supporters be many or few, nor concern ourselves in the least about the party machinery which may be needed to give them effect."

"The fate of the organized movement toward this latter end disposes of that particular form and method of impressing them upon the voters of Kentucky, and we shall certainly neither make nor join any further effort in that direction. On the other hand, the purposes and tendencies of the Republican party are equally opposed with the excess of the radical Democrats to our ideas of good government, and we shall not be a party to any movement having for its object nothing higher or nobler than the preference of one set of extreme and objectionable politicians over another set of equally objectionable and extreme politicians. In the end, perhaps, the people will come to see that neither set of extremes are good for them, for the body politic or the body corporate."

HENRY WATTERSON.

New Hope for the Democracy, Says Mayor Harrison.

"The people are in sympathy with Democratic ideas."

"The recent elections should give new hope to the Democracy."

"A convention called in the name of Democracy, in that very act reaffirms the Democratic faith."



By Carter Harrison.

CHICAGO, Nov. 7.—The recent elections should give new hope to the Democracy. If the change of sentiment had been confined to certain localities, the cause might have been sought in local influences.

The apparent strengthening of Democracy in all parts of the Union goes to show that the Democratic party, with its native vigor and virility, will take more whippings and still survive and thrive than the Republican party can ever administer. The Democracy stands committed to-day to the policies and ideas it adopted in July of '96; in other words the Chicago platform contains the dogmas of party belief to which all true, loyal Democrats must give earnest and undivided support until those dogmas are either reaffirmed or amended by a new national convention.

WHETHER THOSE PRINCIPLES OF PARTY BELIEF WERE SPECIFICALLY INDORSED IN THE VARIOUS NOMINATING CONVENTIONS OF THE PAST SIX MONTHS OR NOT REALLY AMOUNTS TO BUT LITTLE. A CONVENTION CALLED IN THE NAME OF DEMOCRACY IN THAT VERY ACT REAFFIRMS THE DEMOCRATIC FAITH, AND THE DEMOCRATIC FAITH CAN BE FOUND IN THE PRONOUNCEMENTS OF A DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION ALONE.

The convention which nominated the city ticket victorious in Chicago last April reaffirmed the principles of Democracy as laid down by all the Democratic conventions of the past. The convention nominating Judge Van Wyck for Mayor of Greater New York contented itself with advocating local issues only. Personally, I believe the New York idea the proper one, that while it is necessary to preserve party organization in local as well as State and national affairs, municipal fights should be made by the party organizations upon local ideas and local issues.

Judge Van Wyck was selected as the standard bearer in the Greater New York fight as one who had been loyal to the national ticket in 1896. He was nominated as a Democrat, and while the local issues involved in his campaign may have had much to do with bringing about the superb plurality by which he was elected, the influence of national affairs in his election cannot be ignored.

IT OCCURS TO ME THAT THE FIGHT BETWEEN THE TWO GREAT PARTIES IN THE NATION TO-DAY IS REALLY BUT A CONFLICT BETWEEN MONOPOLY AS REPRESENTED BY REPUBLICANISM AND THE PEOPLE AS REPRESENTED BY DEMOCRACY. THE BATTLE FOR THE USE OF BOTH METALS AS FORMING THE BASIS FOR THE CURRENCY OF THE COUNTRY IS AS MUCH AN ANTI-CLASS, AN ANTI-MONOPOLY FIGHT AS IS THE OPPOSITION TO THE TARIFF ROBBERS AND THE VARIOUS TRUSTS THAT ARE TO-DAY DOMINATING NATIONAL LEGISLATION.

In Line With Western Democracy.

The victory in Greater New York, won on a platform favoring municipal ownership of natural monopolies, shows the Democracy of the Nation's great metropolis in line with the party in the West demanding redress for the people from the oppression of the corporations. The fact that the platform did not specifically reaffirm the principles advocated by the Chicago convention dwindle in importance when attention is called to the fact that the ticket was nominated as a Democratic ticket, the nominee was known as a loyal Democrat, and nothing in either platform or campaign was said or done in derogation of the National platform.

I regard the victory in Greater New York as offering encouragement to the supporters of William J. Bryan in 1898 equal to that afforded by the reduction of Republican majorities in Iowa and in President McKinley's home State of Ohio. They all go to show the people are in sympathy with Democratic ideas. The revulsion of feeling, as evidenced by the recent Democratic successes, bodes but little good in the Federal elections of 1900 to the trusts and corporations.

CARTER H. HARRISON.

All Eyes Upon Van Wyck Now.

By Willis J. Abbot.

The first lesson, to my mind, as a result of the campaign is that New York is essentially a Democratic State, and Greater New York a Democratic city.

Personally, I believe that had Mr. Henry George, who, I believe, represented the highest type of Democracy, lived, his vote would have shown how strong the progressive Democracy is even here. But with his death his followers naturally, and, I believe properly, went back to the candidate who most nearly approached in his views and in his following the real Democracy.

This for the city. As for the State as a whole, there was never any issue between the George Democrats and the organization Democrats. We were as hearty in our support of Judge Parker as they, and we rejoice equally with them in his success.

I think it a very great reason for satisfaction that every party in New York was forced to put into its platform planks which, ten years ago, would have been called socialistic. And it seems to me that the great lesson of the election is that the party which won an overwhelming triumph stands pledged for dollar gas and municipal ownership of franchises. This, notwithstanding the fact that some of the leaders of that party are not wholly without personal and selfish interests in public franchises themselves.

The lesson of the election is still in its primary stage. I believe that the Democratic party now victorious is competent to carry it to its logical conclusion, but equally, I believe, there will be in the city of New York a body of men ready and competent to watch, day by day, the action of the Van Wyck administration in its relation to the public franchises, whether those franchises be for gas, street railways, ferries or any other natural monopoly.

WILLIS J. ABBOT.

"Tired of Republican Rule."

By Charles D. Lane.

I was in Europe during the campaign, and while there I understood that the Democrats had indorsed the Chicago platform. On my arrival here I was surprised to learn otherwise.

However, the great Democratic victories go to show that the people are tired of Republican rule. Even if the Democratic party of Greater New York did not actually indorse Bryan's stand, its leaders were important factors in our great silver fight of a year ago.

In voting for and electing the Democratic ticket the people showed their partiality to the party friendly to our cause. I think it is a great argument in favor of the progress we are making all over the country.

CHARLES D. LANE.

Chairman National Silver Party.

What the Vote for Low Shows.

By Richard Watson Gilder.

The very large vote for Mr. Low was an evidence of the strength of the sentiment in favor of an independent city government.

I am glad to know that the fight will be kept up vigorously, and believe that the time is not far off when the municipal business of New York will be run by experts, as in other great cities of the world; by men really fired for and devoted to the work, and not by men without experience and with other fish to fry in the way of wirepulling and spoils getting.

RICHARD WATSON GILDER.

Ex-Mayor Grant Takes Issue with William J. Bryan.

"Local issues ruled here altogether."

"All the George men would have been with us if Mr. Bryan had not deterred them."



"Mr. Bryan did nothing for the local Democracy this year."

"The trouble with Mr. Bryan is he cannot adapt himself to changing conditions."

By Ex-Mayor Hugh J. Grant.

THE conclusion of Mr. Bryan that the results of the recent elections indicate popular dissatisfaction with the policy of the Republican party is undoubtedly correct. His declaration that they "presage the overthrow of the Republican party" is not entitled to the same credence as his conclusion.

I heartily hope that the Republican party will be overthrown in 1900, but it is early for any one but an enthusiast like Mr. Bryan to make up his mind what will happen three years hence. The doing, or the not doing, of something just prior to an election is often the cause of the result of that election. A long-continued policy, directed toward a certain end may be robbed of its influence just before the moment it is expected to have its fullest effect. In December, 1887, Grover Cleveland seemed sure of re-election to the Presidency, but he destroyed his chance in one day by sending his tariff message to the Congress.

Why Cleveland Was Beaten.

The facts which turned the tide of public sentiment toward the Democratic party in other States were operative in this State, outside of the new territory of New York City. Here they had but little influence. In the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx they were specially lacking in effectiveness. Local issues ruled here altogether.

The hide-bound Republicans set out to accomplish. The other Republicans, who supported Mr. Low, were animated by a desire to punish Mr. Platt, and a hope that, by playing upon the sentimentality of the voters, they would procure the offices they yearned for. Their associates in the Citizens' Union, who called themselves Democrats, were moved only by an unreasoning, bitter hostility to Tammany Hall.

Most of the George men were enthusiasts, who believed that if a theory to which they subscribed could be put into operation upon the affairs of life, the condition of society would be made better. Others of them were believers in the 16 to 1 theory, who were led astray by their enthusiasm. All of them—single tax enthusiasts and 16 to 1 enthusiasts—ought to have been Democrats. The latter would have been with us if Mr. Bryan had not deterred them. He was "sufficiently acquainted with the local situation in New York City" in 1896 to talk about it with complete assurance. He ought to have been able to make himself acquainted with it in 1897.

Yet George Repudiated Silver.

He did nothing for the local Democracy this year. Every suggestion of his words or acts was to our disadvantage. The secretary of the Democratic National Committee, who is, presumably, very close to him in sympathy, repudiated the candidacy of Judge Van Wyck on the ground that Judge Van Wyck did not stand upon the silver plank of the Chicago platform; and gave to Mr. George whatever support he had to give, although Mr. George had distinctly repudiated the silver theory.

The trouble with Mr. Bryan and the secretary of the National Committee is that they cannot adapt themselves to changing conditions. They insist upon following certain theories, and in disregarding peculiar conditions of life which must affect the influence of those theories in the various parts of the country. Our fight here was a local fight. We were interested in the question of personal liberty and in those old Democratic doctrines which concern municipal conditions. We had no more desire to put into practice world-reforming ideas than we had to continue in operation here the methods of local reformers who had told us that, as a community, we should get from the expenditure of \$24,000,000 a year better municipal conditions than we had got from the expenditure of \$34,000,000, and who, in trying to prove their statement to be true, succeeded only in compelling us to spend \$25,000,000 a year, thus causing us, from their own standpoint, to lose \$21,000,000 a year.

We are Democrats, who insist upon taking things as they are. I shall be happy if, three years hence, Mr. Bryan's present prediction is verified; but I do not take much interest in predictions that have so long to run. Many things are likely to happen between now and 1900. If they happen as Mr. Bryan thinks they will happen, they will justify his assumption of the role of a prophet. If they do not, Mr. Bryan will be grieved. In any event, the Democratic party will remain.

HUGH J. GRANT.

National Issues Out of Place.

By Randolph Guggenheimer.

So far as I can see, the chief lesson of the election is that the people will, under no circumstances, submit to the suppression of alleged reformers. They arose in their might to declare themselves no longer slaves. They sought freedom and found it.

When the tidal wave of so-called reform spread over New York three years ago golden promises were held out to the people. They were told of better times and a much lower rate of taxation. It was said that the public money was expended in a reckless manner and that it was going into the pockets of individuals instead of being expended for the public good. Talk of this sort appeared acceptable, and when the bubble was counted these men of honeyed tongue were declared elected. It only took a few months, however, to disillusion the voters. Instead of a reduction there was an enormous increase in taxation, and public funds disappeared without any particularly brilliant results.

When the Democratic party met in convention a few weeks ago the ideas and opinions of the people had undergone a considerable change. They were tired of these shams and wanted men and principles that could be depended upon. They demanded the controlling of municipal affairs by the voters of the city, not the State. The national issues were not taken into consideration. It was a purely local election and the taxpayers have got what they wanted.

I think the result of the election proves beyond a doubt that national issues should not be allowed to interfere with local campaigns. The people of a city best know how they want to be governed. This election has proved that beyond the shadow of a doubt.

RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER.

President-elect of the Municipal Council.

Non-partisanship Is Unpopular.

By J. Lindsay Gordon.

It seems to me that the lesson taught by the election is that there is nothing that the American citizen will so quickly and angrily resent as an unwarranted interference with his personal liberty. The spirit of our democratic institutions has always been that the least government is the best government, and any political party which makes legislation that unduly and unnecessarily interferes with the personal liberty of the citizen is sure to meet with rebuke from the people as soon as they have the opportunity to administer such rebuke.

The next lesson taught by this election, it seems to me, is that the idea of non-partisanship in municipal government so loudly proclaimed of late by alleged reformers is one which does not appeal to the citizens of the metropolis. As ours is a government essentially of parties in a national sense, so also must it be in a State and municipal sense. In other words, the people demand that there must be some kind of organization behind the persons in office who can be held responsible for their acts.

I think that the election teaches a lesson that the odious Raines law must either be repealed or shorn of all of its objectionable features; that the people shall be given gas at a price not exceeding a dollar and that the public franchises of this municipality, which belong to the people, shall never again be given away without any protection of the people's rights, as has been the practice under the rule of the Republican party.

J. LINDSAY GORDON.

Ex-Governor Flower Expects Victory in 1900.

"I am confident that the lesson taught by the result in New York State will be a guide for the party in 1898 and 1900."

"The vote by which Alton B. Parker triumphed presages a national victory in 1900."



"The complete harmony among Democrats in this State shows that harmony is not only possible but easily probable."

"New York is a tower of strength within itself and is still the pivotal State."

By Roswell P. Flower.

THE vote by which Alton B. Parker, the one State candidate for the Democracy, triumphed, presages a national victory in 1900. If the same wise counsel prevails throughout the country then as was displayed by the party leaders in New York during this campaign, success is already a certainty.

THE COMPLETE HARMONY AMONG DEMOCRATS ATTAINED IN THIS STATE SHOWS THAT HARMONY IS NOT ONLY POSSIBLE, BUT EASILY PROBABLE. IT WAS OBTAINED HERE AT NO SACRIFICE OF PRINCIPLE. THE REAL UNDERLYING CREED OF DEMOCRACY WAS PLEDGED ANEW. THAT IS ALL. CONSERVATISM WAS PERMITTED TO CONTROL, AND NEEDLESSLY IRRITATING ISSUES INJECTED INTO OTHER CONTESTS WERE AVOIDED.

The wisdom of this course is now amply proved. Harmony has been the outcome and victory the result. New York returns to the Democratic fold by a splendid majority. In other States, where warring factions still refused to lay aside petty differences, the Democrats lost. Massachusetts, Ohio, Maryland, despite the desire of the voters to give them to the control of the party of the people, are aligned in the ranks of Republicanism purely because of continued bickering within the Democratic lines in those States. This would not have been true had the same wise course been pursued there as was followed in New York.

I AM CONFIDENT, HOWEVER, THAT THE LESSON TAUGHT BY THE RESULT IN NEW YORK STATE WILL BE A GUIDE FOR THE PARTY IN 1898 AND 1900.

New York is a tower of strength within itself. It is still the pivotal State and won to the Democracy will lead the procession of commonwealths to harmony and victory in the future.

ROSSELL P. FLOWER.

Democratic Victory in 1900.

By William L. Brown.

The principal lesson taught by the recent campaign in New York is that the prevailing sentiment is democratic. It has always been thought to be the bulwark of Democracy, and the claim is now vindicated.

The people have desired at all times in this great municipal centre liberty, integrity and honesty in the administration of public affairs, without pretence, sham or hypocritical reform. It proves that we want a great big city, as it is—big in principle, I mean—personal liberty and lots of freedom under the form of law.

The elections in other States show that the people are not satisfied with the administration of public affairs at Washington. The hoped-for and promised prosperity has not arrived with any stability or any presentment that the people are satisfied with.

The clear indications from the election are that the Democrats will carry the country in 1900, and the person who fills the popular eye and popular thought of the masses of the people is William Jennings Bryan.

WILLIAM L. BROWN.

As the Citizens' Union Sees It.

By James B. Reynolds.

One lesson taught by the past campaign was the power of money. From 75,000 to 100,000 votes were bought by Tammany Hall. The Citizens' Union refused to buy votes; nor will it employ that method in future campaigns.

Another lesson is the unfair condition of the laws governing independent nominations and the conduct of the election. The Citizens' Union and the Jeffersonian Democracy both had to fight their way to obtain what ought to be the simplest right of every citizen, the right to name and vote for candidates of his choice. Both of these independent parties suffered at the hands of election inspectors, whose first interest was that of their party, and whose only obligations were to their party. The inspectors of election ought to be non-partisan officials appointed after civil service examinations.

Another lesson is that 180,000 citizens of this city desire honest, non-partisan government, uncontrolled by either of the existing national parties. This is a most encouraging result, and the determination of both the Citizens' Union and the Jeffersonian Democracy to continue their work is a fact which the national machines will do well to consider in their treatment of the Greater New York both at the City Hall and the State Capitol. Their conduct will be scrutinized by two parties conscious of their strength and increasing power.

Still another lesson is the tremendous need of educating our citizens to a realization of their need of true democracy. Few of us would have believed that one man would be allowed to trample down the wishes of his own party and name the first Mayor of the Greater New York. Party management in New York has become a political monarchy, and our citizens must fight to obtain real democracy and genuine republicanism.

JAMES B. REYNOLDS.

Chairman Committee Citizens' Executive Union.

The People in a New Light.

By E. B. Amend.

The lesson of this election is, in my opinion, one of a very complex character. It showed, to a certain extent, the people in an entirely new light. In the first place, it proved conclusively that they were tired of alleged reform, and, in the second place, that they had no use whatever for certain sections of the Raines law.

I think the Raines law had a great deal to do with the people declaring for Tammany. Then, again, the great strength of the independent or silent vote was shown to advantage. Mr. Low's followers were independent, pure and simple. They were all opposed to the machines. Mr. Low fought Platt as hard as he did Tammany. He polled nearly 150,000 votes, which shows that a tremendously large section of the population is antagonistic to political machines, of no matter what complexion. It was the greatest showing, I believe, ever made by a man nominated outside of either of the big parties.

Just what Henry George would have done had he lived we can only guess. Where his strength went is also a surmise. I judge it went chiefly to Tammany. Most of his followers were Democrats, who clung to him purely through sentiment.

Now, as to the influence of national issues in local campaigns, this election has been more than eloquent. Mr. Platt dragged in President McKinley and was hopelessly beaten. Tammany avoided the Chicago platform and won with ease. The Jeffersonian Democracy stood by the principles of Bryan and polled only a few thousand votes. The only conclusion you can draw from these results is that the people have no use for national issues in municipal campaigns. They judge the city is capable of making and enforcing the laws best suited to the proper government, happiness and prosperity of its inhabitants.

E. B. AMEND.

President German-American Reform Union.